REMARKS:

Claims 1-3 are currently being examined, of which claim 1 has been amended herein.

The Examiner has objected to the abstract due to an informality. In particular, the Examiner

has objected to the term "comprising" in line 1 of the abstract. The abstract, as amended, does not

include the term "comprising." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection

should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-3 on the ground of nonstatutory

obviousness-type double-patenting as being obvious over claims 1 and 4 of Application No.

10/534,283.

Applicant respectfully traverses this provisional rejection, for the following reasons.

Claim 1 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/534,283 sets forth: "A solid electrolytic

capacitor comprising a capacitor element which includes an anode foil and a cathode foil rolled with

a separator interposed therebetween, and a layer of a solid electrolyte or an electrically conductive

polymer provided therein, wherein the cathode foil is coated with a film of a titanium-containing

compound metal nitride selected from the group consisting of aluminum titanium nitride, chromium

titanium nitride, and zirconium titanium nitride."

-6-

Claim 1, as amended herein, of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/539,119 sets forth: "A

solid electrolytic capacitor comprising a capacitor element which includes an anode foil and a

cathode foil rolled with a separator interposed therebetween, and a layer of a solid electrolyte or an

electrically conductive polymer provided therein, wherein the cathode foil is coated with a film of

a metal nitride or a non-valve metal, wherein the anode foil has substantially the same width as the

separator to make capacitance greater than a capacitor in which the anode foil has smaller width than

that of the separator to prevent contact with the cathode, wherein the cathode foil has a smaller width

than that of the anode foil for both foils to prevent contact each other while maintaining capacitance

unchanged."

Claim 1 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/534,283 does not explicitly set forth the

following features: "wherein the anode foil has substantially the same width as the separator to

make capacitance greater than a capacitor in which the anode foil has smaller width than that of the

separator to prevent contact with the cathode, wherein the cathode foil has a smaller width than that

of the anode foil for both foils to prevent contact each other while maintaining capacitance

unchanged."

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the provisional rejection should be

withdrawn.

-7-

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over USP 6,052,273

(Inoue) in view of JP 04-071214 (JP '214).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, for the following reasons.

The Examiner has suggested that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art to make the cathode foil having a width smaller than the width of anode foil.

However, Inoue and JP '214, alone or in combination, fail to disclose a capacitor which

prevents both foils of cathode and anode from contacting each other while maintaining its

capacitance unchanged. Inoue and JP '214, alone or in combination, fail to disclose a capacitor in

which the anode foil has smaller width than that of the separator to prevent contact with cathode foil

while maintaining its capacitance unchanged.

Inoue and JP '214, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following

features set forth in claim 1, as amended: "wherein the anode foil has substantially the same width

as the separator to make capacitance greater than a capacitor in which the anode foil has smaller

width than that of the separator to prevent contact with the cathode, wherein the cathode foil has a

smaller width than that of the anode foil for both foils to prevent contact each other while

maintaining capacitance unchanged," in combination with the other claimed features.

-8-

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/539,119 Response filed September 8, 2006 Reply to OA dated June 8, 2006

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 2 and 3 should be withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims currently pending are in condition for examination.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patént Application Serial No. 10/539,119 Response filed September 8, 2006 Reply to OA dated June 8, 2006

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time, and any other fees which may be due now or in the future with respect to this application, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,

HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

Darren R. Crew Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 37,806

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

DRC/llf

Atty. Docket No. 050385

Suite 1000

1725 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2930

Enclosures: Substitute Abstract of Disclosure